

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. The Applicant has canceled claims 1-14 and submits that new claims 15-31, are written to overcome this rejection. These new claims have been written according to the suggestions of the Examiner in order to provide proper antecedent basis for all of the objected-to terms.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Berger et al.* The Applicant submits that *Berger* does not disclose a plastic layer being jointly extruded with the material forming the releasing properties as shown in the present invention. Therefore, more than one extrusion step is required in *Berger et al.* In addition, the present invention only requires a small amount of material for producing the releasing properties as compared to *Berger et al.* Furthermore, the present invention prevents the releasing material from diffusing into the adhesive, especially if the materials are jointly stored over a long period of time.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Friedman et al.* *Friedman et al.* describes a blend of polymethylpentene and polypropylene having improved release properties. The Applicant submits that this reference does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by *Higgins*. *Higgins* describes a mixture of silicone and curable polymer as the release layer. *Higgins* does not disclose the insertion of the release layer before extruding the plastic layer.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by *Adamko et al.* *Adamko et al.* discloses a silicone-free release film that comprises a linear ethylenic polymer. *Adamko* does not include a material for producing releasing properties disposed in the plastic layer.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection based on the product-by-process being obvious from a product of the prior art that is made by a different process. The Applicant has rewritten the claims to provide product claims and process claims. Therefore, these new claims overcome the product-by-process rejection.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Berger et al.*, *Friedman et al.*, *Higgins* and *Adamko et al.* In view of the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the new independent claim 15 is patentable over the prior art and therefore claim 22, incorporating the elements of

canceled claim 13, should also be patentable. Also newly added article claim 31 recites a very unique combination of structural features not disclosed in the prior art.

The Applicant submits that this application is patentable over the prior art, either singly or in combination. Early allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
WALTER GUENTER



COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Allison C. Collard, Reg. No. 22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048
Attorney for Applicants

Enclosures: Copy of Petition for 2 Month Extension of Time for
Large Entity

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on February 22, 2001.


Lisa L. Vulpis

R:\Reine\Amendments\Guenter-1-pct-amd.wpd